

**REMARKS**

Claims 1, 3-8, 10-15 and 17-21 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, the Abstract, specification and claims 1, 4-5, 7-8, 10, 12, 14-15, 17 and 19-21 are amended and claims 2, 9 and 16 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Various amendments are made for clarity and are unrelated to issues of patentability.

The Office Action objects to the Abstract because the Abstract should be limited to a single paragraph. It is respectfully submitted that the Substitute Abstract obviates the grounds for objection. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 3-8, 10-15 and 17-21 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) by U.S. Patent 7,095,888 to Kim. The Office Action also rejects claims 2, 9 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Kim in view of Alleged Admitted Prior Art (hereafter AAPA). The rejections are respectfully traversed with respect to the pending claims.

The present application and Kim are both commonly assigned to LG Electronics Inc. That is, at the time the invention was made, both the present application and Kim were owned or under an obligation of assignment to the same assignee, LG Electronics Inc.

The Office Action rejects previous claims 2, 9 and 16 in an obviousness rejection. By this Amendment, each of independent claims 1, 8 and 15 are amended to include features recited in previous dependent claims 2, 9 and 16 (with minor amendments). Thus, the rejection of each of independent claims 1, 8 and 15 would be an obviousness rejection based on Kim in view of the APA. However, in view of 35 U.S.C. §103(c), Kim is disqualified as prior art to the present

Reply to Office Action dated April 18, 2007

application (for each of amended independent claim 1, 8 and 15 and their corresponding dependent claims). Thus, the rejection should be withdrawn.

Furthermore, the Office Action states that AAPA discloses sizes of red, green and blue sub-pixels. The Office Action states that FIGs. 2 and 3 are AAPA, even though these figures are not admitted in the specification to be prior art. Additionally, AAPA does not teach or suggest all the features of each of independent claims 1, 8 and 15. Thus, each of independent claims 1, 8 and 15 defines patentable subject matter.

Each of the dependent claims depends from one of the independent claims and therefore defines patentable subject matter at least for this reason. In addition, the dependent claims recite features that further and independently distinguish over the applied references.

### **CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance of claims 1, 3-8, 10-15 and 17-21 are earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this,

Serial No. **10/803,907**

Docket No. **YHK-0133**

Reply to Office Action dated April 18, 2007

concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and  
please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,  
KED & ASSOCIATES, LLP



David C. Oren  
Registration No. 38,694

Attachment: Substitute Abstract

P.O. Box 221200  
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200  
(703) 766-3777 DCO/kah

**Date: October 18, 2007**

**Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610**